From: Roser, Sara
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 4:07 PM
To: Randee.Tubal@doh.hawaii.gov
Cc: Okubo, Watson T
Subject: FW: Ewa (open coastal) bacti
Attachments: Honouliuli bacti revisited.xlsx

Hi Randee, I mentioned this to Watson last week. Please take a look at Jennifer's attached spreadsheet. I am wondering if this assessment follows the listing criteria you are discussing for the 2014 303(d) list.

Thanks, Sara

Sara Roser
Standards and TMDL Office(WTR-2)
USEPA Region 9
415-972-3513

----- Forwarded by Sara Roser/R9/USEPA/US on 06/12/2013 03:59 PM -----

From: "Doi, Jennifer Y" <jennifer.doi@doh.hawaii.gov>
To: Sara Roser/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 09/19/2012 06:14 PM
Subject: Ewa (open coastal) bacti

Hi Sara,

I reassessed the Ewa (open coastal) HIW00189 bacti data. I separated nearshore vs offshore. I also separated each point by depth. The geomean was evaluated by month, regardless of number of samples per month, as opposed to 5 sample running geomean. I use "exceedence" as over 10% rule.

All 4 nearshore (HN) points were clean, thus the nearshore set was clean.

There are 7 HB, 4 HM, and HZ points in the offshore set. HB2 - HB5 surround HZ. HM1 - HM4 make up the next perimeter. HB1, HB6, and HB7 are further away from HZ. I grouped all the offshore points together, as well as only the 2 perimeters around HZ. Both groups had low geomean exceedences, but both had high instances of SSM exceedences. The 2 perimeters points combined depth had low geomean exceedences, but high SSM exceedences. After parsing the depths, all the bottom depths exceed the geomean and SSM. The surface and middle depths had low geomeans, but SSM exceedences.

So now, do we make separate Nearshore and Offshore "decision units", or keep them combined as I have it? Offshore combined has low geomean but high SSM, so if we say Offshore is clean, then might as well keep nearshore and offshore together.*(See attached file: Honouliuli bacti revisited.xlsx)*